



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/353,805	01/27/2003	William A. McCarty	KSCII.007A	7689

20995 7590 10/02/2006

KNOBBE MARTENS OLSON & BEAR LLP
2040 MAIN STREET
FOURTEENTH FLOOR
IRVINE, CA 92614

EXAMINER

LAO, LUN S

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2615

DATE MAILED: 10/02/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/353,805

Applicant(s)

MCCARTY ET AL.

Examiner

Lun-See Lao

Art Unit

2615

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 July 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-64 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-64 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>04-29-2003</u> | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Introduction

1. This action is response to the applicant's election filed on 07-17-2006.

Applicant elects, without traverse, to proceed with examination being directed toward the first group, which is claimed in Claims 1-64 of the application. Group I is drawn to a speaker network. Claims 1-64 are pending.

Drawings

2. The drawings are objected to because the hand writing, the formal drawings required. Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner,

the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Double Patenting

3. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

4. Claims 1-64 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-46 and US application

number 10/783,718. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other.

Consider claims 1-64, substantially all the claimed steps in these claims were recited in claims 1-46 of the application 10/783,718 identified above, such as the steps of: "a method for providing an audio signal and a control signal that is generated

by an input device to a remote loudspeaker via a network, the method comprising: receiving an audio signal from the input device; detecting a characteristic associated with the audio signal; coding the characteristic into a control signal; and transmitting the audio signal and the control signal to a loudspeaker via the network " (see US patent application 10/783,718, claims 1-46, page 32 line 2-page 35 line 9).

Because claims 1-64 of US patent application 10/353,805 are similar in scope to claims 1-46 of the US patent application 10/783,718 with obvious wording variation, they are both describing a transmitter configured to receive at least a second portion of the audio signal from the device and transmit audio signals to a remote loudspeaker. Claims 1-64 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-46 of U.S. Patent application 10/783,718.

Furthermore, there is no apparent reason why applicant would be prevented from presenting claims corresponding to those of the instant application in the other copending application. See *In re Schneller*, 397 F.2d 350, 158 USPQ 210 (CCPA 1968). See also MPEP § 804.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

6. Claim 1-5, 10-25, 33-37 and 42-57 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Anderson (US PAT. 5,406,634).

Consider claim 1 Anderson teaches a method for providing an audio signal and a control signal that is generated by an input device to a remote loudspeaker via a network (see figs.1-2), the method comprising:

receiving an audio signal from the input device (13,15);

detecting (by DSP, 32) a characteristic associated with the audio signal (see col. 2 line 28-42);

coding (12,32) the characteristic into a control signal; and

transmitting (16) the audio signal and the control signal to a loudspeaker (22) via the network (see col. 2 lines 17-28 and col. 3 line 33-col. 4 line 46).

Consider claim 33 it is the system claim corresponding to the method claim 1. See previous method claim 1 rejection.

Consider claims 2-5 Anderson teach the method of further comprising: decoding (see fig.2, 32,35) the control signal at the loudspeaker (39); manipulating the audio signal based on the decoded control signal; and providing the manipulated audio signal to the

loudspeaker (22) for broadcast (see col. 4 line 33-68); and the method of further comprising digitally amplifying the audio signal (see fig.6 and co. 4 line 33-68); and receiving (see figs 1-2) an address signal which is associated with the loudspeaker (22), the audio signal, and the control signal; coding (12,32) the address signal; transmitting (16) the address signal via the network (24,26 and see col. 2 line 17-28) to the loudspeaker (22) and to a next loudspeaker (22); decoding the address signal at the loudspeaker (22); decoding the address at the next loudspeaker (22); and broadcasting the audio signal at the loudspeaker (22) if the address signal is associated with the loudspeaker (22); and broadcasting the audio signal at the next loudspeaker (22) if the address signal is associated with the next loudspeaker (22 and see col. 3 line 63-col. 4 line 68); and the method of the network is wired (see fig.1 and col. 2 line 17-28 and col. 3 line 33-67).

Consider claims 35-37 they are the system claims corresponding to method claims 3-5. Thus note claims 3-5 respectively for rejection.

Consider claims 10-19 Anderson teaches the converting the audio signal from an analog form to a digital form (see fig.1, 12) prior to transmitting (16) the audio signal (see col. 3 line 35-col. 4 line 46); and the detected control signal is analog (see fig.2, 37); and the audio signal is digital (15); and the detected control signal is digital (32, DSP); and the control signal is a volume level (see fig.6); and the control signal is a balance level (see fig.6); and the control signal is a fader level (see fig.6); and the control signal is a sub-bass level (read on low frequency and see col.6 lines 53-65); and the control signal is a destination source see col. 3 line 33-col. 4 line 68); and the

Art Unit: 2615

control signal is a sound processing selection (32 DSP and see col. 3 line 33-col. 4 line 68).

Consider claims 42-51 they are the system claims corresponding to method claims 10-19. Thus note claims 10-19 respectively for rejection.

Consider claims 20-25 Anderson teaches that the control signal is an equalizer level (see fig.6 and col. 6 line 53-65); and the control signal is an address (see col. 4 line 33-58); the control signal is a power on; and the control signal is a power off (by DSP switch module 34 and see col. 4 line 33-58); and the control signal is a time delay; and the control signal is a phase delay (see col. Col. 2 line 17-64).

Consider claims 52-57 they are the system claims corresponding to method claims 20-25. Thus note claims 20-25 respectively for rejection.

Consider claim 34 Anderson teaches that a Digital Signal Processor (DSP) (see fig.2, 32) module configured to manipulate the audio signal based on the extracted control signal (see col.3 line 63-col. 4 line 68).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 2615

8. Claims 6-9, 32, 38-41 and 64 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anderson (US PAT. 5,406,634).

Consider claims 6-9 Anderson fails to teach that the network is a powerline; and the network is wireless; the network is RF; and the network is IR. However Anderson teach a network system, but Anderson does not limit his network to any specific kind. These network (office notice is taken) are well known in the art.

Therefore, it would have been obvious that the network system as taught by Anderson could have been a powerline network; or a wireless network; or a RF network; or an IR network. Since the system of Anderson would have operated well using any of these kinds of network.

Consider claims 38-41 they are the system claims corresponding to method claims 6-9. Thus note claims 6-9 respectively for rejection.

Consider claim 32 Anderson does not teach that the loudspeaker is a headphone. However the headphone is well known in the art (the office notice is taken). Therefore, it would have been obvious that the speaker system as taught by Anderson could have used the headphone so that less disturbance could have been caused to people surrounding the user.

Consider claim 64 it is the system claim corresponding to the method claim 32. See previous method claim 32 rejection.

Art Unit: 2615

9. Claims 26-29 and 58-61 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anderson (US PAT. 5,406,634) in view of Chang et al. (US PAT. 6,507,273).

Consider claims 26, 28 Anderson does not teach automatically powering a transmitter in response to receiving the audio signal from the input device; and automatically powering off the transmitter in response to not receiving the audio signal from the input device for a period of time.

However, Chang teaches transmitter (see fig.1, 30) in response to receiving the audio signal from the input device (other computer, 30); and automatically powering off the transmitter in response to not receiving the audio signal from the input device for a period of time (read on automatically power on/off at a specified time and see col.2 line 33-col. 3 line 44).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Chang into Anderson to provide more efficiency communication system.

Consider claims 27, 29 Anderson fails to teach automatically powering a receiver in response to receiving the audio signal and the control signal via the network; and automatically powering off the receiver in response to not receiving the audio signal and the control signal via the network.

However, Chang teach automatically powering a receiver (see fig.1, 30) in response to receiving the audio signal and the control signal via the network (see col. 2 line 33-col. 3 line 44); and automatically powering off the receiver in response to not

receiving the audio signal and the control signal via the network (see col. 2 line 33-col. 3 line 44).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Chang into Anderson to provide more efficiency communication system.

Consider claims 58-61 they are the system claims corresponding to method claims 26-29. Thus note claims 26-29 respectively for rejection.

10. Claims 30-31 and 62-63 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anderson (US PAT. 5,406,634) in view of Bader (US PAT. 7,043,671).

Consider claims 30-31 Anderson does not clearly teach that the control signal is in an I² C format and the audio signal is an inter IC sound.

However, Bader teaches that the control signal is in an I² C format (well known) and the audio signal is an inter IC sound (see fig.6 and col.17 line 23-45).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Bader into Anderson to provide a cheaper communication system.

Consider claims 62-63 they are the system claims corresponding to method claims 30-31. Thus note claims 30-31 respectively for rejection.

Conclusion

Art Unit: 2615

11. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Piercy et al. (US PAT. 6,157,292) and Gertz (US PAT. 5,646,602) are cited to show other related wire, wireless, infrared, and powerline audio entertainment systems.

12. Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Mail Stop ____ (explanation, e.g., Amendment or After-final, etc.)

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Facsimile responses should be faxed to:
(571) 273-8300

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to:
Customer Service Window
Randolph Building
401 Dulany Street
Alexandria, VA 22314

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Lao,Lun-See whose telephone number is (571) 272-7501. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 8:00 to 5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Chin Vivian, can be reached on (571) 272-7848.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Technology Center 2600 whose telephone number is (571) 272-2600.

Lao,Lun-See
Patent Examiner
US Patent and Trademark Office
Knox
571-272-7501
Date 09-21-2006



VIVIAN CHIN
PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600



#3

PATENT

Case Docket No. KSCII.007A

3635

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicants : McCarty et al.
Appl. No. : 10/353,805
Filed : January 27, 2003
For : WIRED, WIRELESS,
INFRARED, AND
POWERLINE AUDIO
ENTERTAINMENT SYSTEMS
Examiner : Unassigned
Group Art Unit : 3635

) I hereby certify that this correspondence and all
) marked attachments are being deposited with the
) United States Postal Service as first class mail in
) an envelope addressed to: United States Patent
) and Trademark Office, P.O. Box 2327,
) Arlington, VA 22202, on

4/25/03

(Date)

James F. Herkenhoff, Reg. No. 51,241


TRANSMITTAL LETTER

United States Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 2327
Arlington, VA 22202

Dear Sir:

Enclosed for filing in the above-identified application are:

- (X) An Information Disclosure Statement.
- (X) A PTO Form 1449 with 43 references.
- (X) The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required, or credit any overpayment, to Account No. 11-1410.
- (X) Return prepaid postcard.


James F. Herkenhoff
Registration No. 51,241
Attorney of Record
Customer No. 20,995
(619) 235-8550

SADOCVJFHVFH-3354.DOC
042203

RECEIVED
MAY 01 2003
GROUP 3600

KSCII.007A



PATENT

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant : McCarty et al.) Group Art Unit 3635
App. No. : 10/353,805)
Filed : January 27, 2003)
For : WIRED, WIRELESS,)
INFRARED, AND)
POWERLINE AUDIO)
ENTERTAINMENT)
SYSTEMS)
Examiner : Unassigned

RECEIVED

MAY 01 2003

GROUP 3600

INFORMATION DISCLOSURE STATEMENT

United States Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 2327
Arlington, VA 22202


Dear Sir:

Enclosed is form PTO-1449 listing references that are also enclosed. This Information Disclosure Statement is being filed within three months of the filing date of this application or upon filing if this is a CPA or RCE, and no fee is required in accordance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.97(b)(1), (b)(2), or (b)(4).

Respectfully submitted,

KNOBBE, MARTENS, OLSON & BEAR, LLP

Dated: 4/25/03

By: 
James F. Herkenhoff
Registration No. 51,241
Attorney of Record
Customer No. 20,995
(619) 235-8550

S:\DOCS\VFH\VFH-3359.DOC\042303



SHEET 1 OF 2

FORM PTO-1449 APR 29 2003 INFORMATION DISCLOSURE STATEMENT BY APPLICANT (USE SEVERAL SHEETS IF NECESSARY)	U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE	ATTY. DOCKET NO. KSCII.007A	APPLICATION NO. 10/353,805
		APPLICANT McCarthy et al.	
		FILING DATE January 27, 2003	GROUP 3835

U.S. PATENT DOCUMENTS

EXAMINER INITIAL		DOCUMENT NUMBER	DATE	NAME	CLASS	SUBCLASS	FILING DATE (IF APPROPRIATE)
L.S.	1.	3,942,170	03/02/76	Whyte			
L.S.	2.	4,319,224	03/09/82	Tappeiner et al.			
L.S.	3.	4,523,128	06/11/85	Stamm et al.			
L.S.	4.	4,845,751	07/04/89	Schwab			
L.S.	5.	5,095,382	03/10/92	Abe			
L.S.	6.	5,218,841	06/08/93	Abe et al.			
L.S.	7.	5,410,735	04/25/95	Borchardt et al.			
L.S.	8.	5,471,190	11/28/95	Zimmermann			
L.S.	9.	5,596,603	01/21/97	Haupt et al.			
L.S.	10.	5,652,768	07/29/97	Matsumura et al.			
L.S.	11.	5,666,658	09/09/97	Borchardt et al.			
L.S.	12.	5,784,468	07/21/98	Klayman			
L.S.	13.	5,946,343	08/31/99	Schotz et al.			
L.S.	14.	6,008,115	12/21/99	Wingate			
L.S.	15.	6,041,225	03/21/00	Jung			
L.S.	16.	6,157,292	12/05/00	Piercy et al.			
L.S.	17.	6,215,981 B1	04/10/01	Borchardt et al.			
L.S.	18.	6,243,413 B1	08/05/01	Beukema			
L.S.	19.	6,337,913 B1	01/08/02	Chang			

RECEIVED

MAY 01 2003

GROUP 3800

FOREIGN PATENT DOCUMENTS

EXAMINER INITIAL		DOCUMENT NUMBER	DATE	COUNTRY	CLASS	SUBCLASS	TRANSLATION	
							YES	NO
L.S.	20.	EP 0 389 174	09/26/90	EP				
L.S.	21.	EP 0 389 174 B1	09/26/90	EP				
L.S.	22.	EP 0 471 477 A1	02/19/92	EP				
L.S.	23.	EP 0 471 477 B1	02/19/92	EP				

EXAMINER

/Lun Lao/ (105/10/2006)

*EXAMINER: INITIAL IF CITATION CONSIDERED, WHETHER OR NOT CITATION IS IN CONFORMANCE WITH MPEP 809; DRAW LINE THROUGH CITATION IF NOT IN CONFORMANCE AND NOT CONSIDERED, INCLUDE COPY OF THIS FORM WITH NEXT COMMUNICATION TO APPLICANT.



FORM PTO-1449

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICEATTY. DOCKET NO.
KSCII.007AAPPLICATION NO.
10/353,605INFORMATION DISCLOSURE STATEMENT
BY APPLICANT

(USE SEVERAL SHEETS IF NECESSARY)

APPLICANT
McCarthy et al.FILING DATE
January 27, 2003GROUP
3635

FOREIGN PATENT DOCUMENTS

EXAMINER INITIAL		DOCUMENT NUMBER	DATE	COUNTRY	CLASS	SUBCLASS	TRANSLATION	
							YES	NO
L.S.	24	EP 0 493 986 B1	12/20/95	EP				
L.S.	25	EP 0 613 320 A2	08/31/94	EP				
L.S.	26	EP 0 613 320 B1	08/31/94	EP				
L.S.	27	EP 0 637 796 A3	03/08/95	EP				
L.S.	28	EP 0 637 796 B1	08/01/94	EP				
L.S.	29	EP 1 096 715 A2	05/02/01	EP				
L.S.	30	EP 1 096 716 A2	05/02/01	EP				
L.S.	31	EP 1 096 717 A2	05/02/01	EP				
L.S.	32	JP 200116879	06/22/01	JP			X (abstract)	
L.S.	33	JP 200116880	06/22/01	JP			X (abstract)	
L.S.	34	JP 200117750	06/29/01	JP			X (abstract)	
L.S.	35	WO 99/39546	08/05/99	PCT				

RECEIVED

MAY 01 2003

GROUP 3600

EXAMINER INITIAL	OTHER DOCUMENTS (INCLUDING AUTHOR, TITLE, DATE, PERTINENT PAGES, ETC.)	
L.S.	36	Communication Systems Design ; "HomePlug Standard Brings Networking to the Home;" 12/2000; http://www.csdmag.com/main/2000/12/0012feat5.htm , 9 pages, printed 1/10/03.
L.S.	37	Intellon Corporation, "PowerPacket™ Primer;" www.intellon.com , 5 pages, undated.
L.S.	38	Texas Instruments, True Digital Audio Amplifier TAS5100 PWM Power Output Stage; www.ti.com , 15 pages, Revised May 2001.
L.S.	39	PhonexBroadband, QX-201 NeverWire 14; www.phonex.com , 1 page.
L.S.	40	Digigram EtherSpeaker, Networked Speaker Development Module; www.digigram.com , 4 pages, undated.
L.S.	41	Meridian's Brochure, "Speakers;" http://meridian-audio.com/m_bro_spk.htm , 6 pages, printed 12/21/01.
L.S.	42	Sony Consumer Electronics Guide: MDR-DS5100; http://www.sel.sony.com/SEL/consumer/ss5/home/accessories/virtualdolbyrtmdigit ; 7 pages, undated.
L.S.	43	FREESPAN™ Pure Digital Transmission, 4 pages, promotional brochure.

S:\DOCS\JFHJFH-3352.DOC
042103

EXAMINER	/Lun Lao/	(09/16/2005)
*EXAMINER: INITIAL IF CITATION CONSIDERED, WHETHER OR NOT CITATION IS IN CONFORMANCE WITH MPEP 606; DRAW LINE THROUGH CITATION IF NOT IN CONFORMANCE AND NOT CONSIDERED, INCLUDE COPY OF THIS FORM WITH NEXT COMMUNICATION TO APPLICANT.		

Notice of References Cited	Application/Control No. 10/353,805		Applicant(s)/Patent Under Reexamination MCCARTY ET AL.	
	Examiner Lun-See Lao		Art Unit 2615	Page 1 of 1

U.S. PATENT DOCUMENTS

*		Document Number Country Code-Number-Kind Code	Date MM-YYYY	Name	Classification
*	A	US-5,406,634	04-1995	Anderson et al.	381/82
*	B	US-5,646,602	07-1997	Gertz et al.	340/825.25
*	C	US-6,157,292	12-2000	Piercy et al.	340/310.01
*	D	US-7,043,671	05-2006	Bader et al.	714/701
*	E	US-6,507,273	01-2003	Chang et al.	340/3.1
	F	US-			
	G	US-			
	H	US-			
	I	US-			
	J	US-			
	K	US-			
	L	US-			
	M	US-			

FOREIGN PATENT DOCUMENTS

*		Document Number Country Code-Number-Kind Code	Date MM-YYYY	Country	Name	Classification
	N					
	O					
	P					
	Q					
	R					
	S					
	T					

NON-PATENT DOCUMENTS

*		Include as applicable: Author, Title Date, Publisher, Edition or Volume, Pertinent Pages)
	U	
	V	
	W	
	X	

*A copy of this reference is not being furnished with this Office action. (See MPEP § 707.05(a).)
Dates in MM-YYYY format are publication dates. Classifications may be US or foreign.